

1	BEFORE THE CITY OF COLUMBUS
2	MUNICIPAL CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION
3	
4	In the matter of:
5	Regular Meeting
6	
7	Grady L. Pettigrew,
8	President, Presiding
9	
10	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
11	
12	Monday, November 29, 2021
13	12:32 p.m. 77 North Front Street
14	Columbus, Ohio 43215
15	
16	MARILYN K. MARTIN, RPR
17	REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL REPORTER
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	ANDERSON REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 3040 Riverside Drive, Suite 125
24	Columbus, Ohio 43221 (614) 326-0177

COLUMBÚS

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

1	COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:
2	Grady L. Pettigrew, President
3	Larry Price Jennifer Lynch
4	PRESENTERS:
5	Beth Dyke Tammy Rollins
6	Carol Lagemann Jennifer Shea
7	Liz Reed
8	ALSO PRESENT:
9	Wendy Brinnon
10	wendy brinnen
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	

COLUMBÚS

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

24



1	PROCEEDINGS
2	BE IT REMEMBERED THAT, on the 29th day of
3	November, 2021, the Municipal Civil Service
4	Commission came for a regular meeting, Grady L.
5	Pettigrew, President. And the parties appearing in
6	person and/or by counsel, as hereinafter set forth,
7	the following proceedings were had:
8	
9	PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: I will call to order
LO	the City of Columbus, Ohio, Municipal Civil Service
L1	Commission regular meeting for November 2021. We
L2	will be following the printed agenda. And the first
L3	item is review and approval of the minutes of the
L 4	October 25, 2021, regular meeting.
L5	MR. PRICE: I move for the approval of the
L 6	minutes from the October 25, 2021, regular meeting.
L7	MS. LYNCH: Second.
L 8	PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say,
L9	"Aye."
20	THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.
21	PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: They are approved.
22	No prehearing conferences. The next item we have,
23	actually item 3A and B. 3A is review and approval of
24	the findings and recommendation of the trial board



1	hearing held on Monday, September 20, 2021, Jennifer
2	McCray versus Columbus City Schools, Secretary II.
3	She was appealing the discharge, and it was Appeal
4	No. 21-BA-0001.
5	And based on certainly participating in
6	the trial board, the recommendation is that the
7	discharge of Ms. McCray be approved and upheld.
8	The Why don't we go ahead and do that
9	one.
10	MR. PRICE: I move the approval of the
11	findings and recommendation of the trial board
12	hearing held on Monday, September 20, '21,
13	10:00 a.m., Jennifer McCray versus Columbus City
14	Schools, Secretary II, discharge Appeal No.
15	21-BA-0001 be upheld.
16	MS. LYNCH: Second.
17	PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say,
18	"Aye."
19	THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.
20	PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: It is approved.
21	The second trial board recommendation is
22	in the review and approval of the findings and
23	recommendation of the trial board hearing held on

Tuesday, October 21, 2021, David Creighton versus



- 1 Columbus City Schools, Creighton, a bus driver who
- was discharged, Appeal No. 21-BA-0003. And the fact
- 3 is that Columbus City Schools proved their case in
- 4 this particular trial board.
- 5 MR. PRICE: I move the approval of the
- 6 findings and recommendation of the trial board
- 7 hearing held on Thursday, October 21, 2021, at
- 8 10:00 a.m., David Creighton versus Columbus City
- 9 Schools, bus driver, discharged, Appeal No.
- 10 21-BA-0003 be upheld.
- MS. LYNCH: Second.
- 12 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say,
- 13 "Aye."
- 14 THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.
- 15 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: It is approved.
- MS. BRINNON: Just clarification for the
- 17 reporter. Commissioner Pettigrew, you stated it was
- 18 Tuesday, October 21, and it was Thursday.
- MR. PRICE: It was Thursday.
- 20 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: Okay. Oh, I said
- 21 Tuesday, and it's actually Thursday. All right.
- 22 Well, thank you.
- 23 Item No. 4 is a request of the Civil
- 24 Service Commission staff to amend Rule VIII(A)(1) to





Τ	add language authorizing a requirement to submit
2	supplementary materials when identified for an exam
3	before an eligible's name can be included on a
4	forthcoming or existing eligible list.
5	MS. REED: Good afternoon, commissioners.
6	I'm Liz Reed. I'm the Civil Service Executive
7	Assistant Director responsible for the testing unit.
8	And staff is proposing this recommendation to Rule
9	VIII(A)(1). It actually stems from this request
10	stems from the audit for the police officer selection
11	process. The audit recommends requesting
12	and accepting personal history summaries or
13	questionnaires before an eligible list is
14	established.
15	This accomplishes several things. First,
16	it reduces the time in the selection process by
17	saving time that it takes to send those personal
18	history questionnaires out and the time it takes for
19	them, the candidates, then to complete those and turn
20	those in. Instead, when the eligible list is
21	established, those personal history questionnaires
22	will already be to the Commission or to the City, and
23	they can begin the background or the background
24	review process immediately upon the establishment of



1	the eligible list.
2	Second, it keeps the list uncluttered with
3	names of candidates who do not opt to submit those
4	summaries. And then, three, it provides more time
5	for candidates to submit the summaries as they can
6	complete those as we are testing and scoring. The
7	Civil Service staff see the benefit of having this
8	option for classifications outside of police officer,
9	such as firefighter and 911 call taker, which also
10	have thorough background investigations as part of
11	the selection process. The CSC staff request your
12	approval of this change to Rule VIII(A)(1).
13	Do you have any questions?
14	MR. PRICE: Can you send me that list,
15	that compilation that you just did for me just so I
16	have it?
17	MS. REED: I'm sorry?
18	MR. PRICE: The background that you just
19	said in terms of the reasoning why it was requested.
20	I just wanted it because I was trying to write some
21	of it down.
22	PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: A copy of what she
23	said?

MR. PRICE: Yes.



23

24

1	MS. REED: Oh, yeah. Sure.
2	MR. PRICE: Yes. Sorry. A copy of what
3	she said.
4	I move to amend Rule VIII(A)(1) to add
5	language authorizing a requirement to submit
6	supplementary materials when identified for an exam
7	before an eligible's name can be included on a
8	forthcoming or existing eligible list.
9	MS. LYNCH: Second.
10	PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say,
11	"Aye."
12	THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.
13	PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: It's approved.
14	Thank you.
15	The next item on the agenda 5 through 10
16	are with no revisions. Item No. 5: Request of the
17	Civil Service Commission staff to approve the
18	specification review for the classification Tree
19	Trimmer Supervisor with no revisions. No. 6 is for
20	the classification Arborist with no revision. No.
21	is for the classification Water Maintenance

Supervisor II with no revisions. And No. 8 is Water

Maintenance Assistant Coordinator with no revision.

No. 9 is Water Maintenance Coordinator with no



1	revision. And No. 10 is Water Maintenance Manager
2	with no revisions.
3	MS. DYKE: Hello. Beth Dyke, personnel
4	analyst for the Civil Service staff.
5	The review of classifications for items 5
6	through 10 is part of the Civil Service Commission
7	staff's effort to review all classifications every
8	four to five years. Based on feedback received, it
9	was determined that the current specifications still
10	accurately reflects the work being performed. It is
11	recommended that the specifications be approved with
12	no revisions.
12 13	no revisions. MR. PRICE: I move to Item 5, I move to
13	MR. PRICE: I move to Item 5, I move to
13 14	MR. PRICE: I move to Item 5, I move to approve the specification review for the
13 14 15	MR. PRICE: I move to Item 5, I move to approve the specification review for the classification Tree Trimmer Supervisor with no
13 14 15 16	MR. PRICE: I move to Item 5, I move to approve the specification review for the classification Tree Trimmer Supervisor with no revisions. I also move to approve the specification
13 14 15 16 17	MR. PRICE: I move to Item 5, I move to approve the specification review for the classification Tree Trimmer Supervisor with no revisions. I also move to approve the specification review for the classification Arborist with no
13 14 15 16 17	MR. PRICE: I move to Item 5, I move to approve the specification review for the classification Tree Trimmer Supervisor with no revisions. I also move to approve the specification review for the classification Arborist with no revisions. No. 7, I also move to approve the
13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. PRICE: I move to Item 5, I move to approve the specification review for the classification Tree Trimmer Supervisor with no revisions. I also move to approve the specification review for the classification Arborist with no revisions. No. 7, I also move to approve the specification review for the classification Water
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. PRICE: I move to Item 5, I move to approve the specification review for the classification Tree Trimmer Supervisor with no revisions. I also move to approve the specification review for the classification Arborist with no revisions. No. 7, I also move to approve the specification review for the classification Water Maintenance Supervisor II with no revisions. No. 8,

approve the specification review for the



1	classification Water Maintenance Coordinator with no
2	revisions. And No. 10, I also move to approve the
3	specification review for the classification Water
4	Maintenance Manager with no revisions.
5	MS. LYNCH: Second the motion.
6	PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say,
7	"Aye."
8	THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.
9	PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: They are approved.
10	Items No. 11 and 12 are joined together.
11	Item No. 11 is request of the Civil Service
12	Commission staff to revise the specification for the
13	classification Information Systems Technician. Item
14	No. 12 is to revise the specification for the
15	classification Information Systems Manager.
16	MS. DYKE: The review of these
17	classifications is part of the Civil Service
18	Commission's effort to review every classification
19	every five years with regards to the Minimum
20	Qualifications Section for Information Systems
21	Technician. Consideration was given to other recent
22	classification reviews with similar minimum
23	qualification requirements. And so it is proposed
24	that the completion of a recognized high school or



1	post secondary vocational program in a related
2	computer technology program be added as a
3	substitution for the experience requirement. Adding
4	such substitution will likely create a larger, more
5	diverse applicant pool, aiding the department with
6	recruitment.
7	Lastly, it is proposed to remove the word
8	contemporary throughout both specifications as it was
9	agreed that the term is dated and no longer
10	effective. There are no other revisions proposed at
11	this time, and it is recommended that the
12	specifications be revised as proposed.
13	MR. PRICE: I move No. 11, I move to
14	revise the specification for the classification
15	Information Systems Technician. No. 12, I move to
16	revise the specification for the classification
17	Information Systems Manager.
18	MS. LYNCH: Second the motion.
19	PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say,
20	"Aye."
21	THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.
22	PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: They are approved.
23	Items No. 13 and 14 have been deferred.
24	Item No. 15 is the request of the Civil Service



1	Commission staff to revise the specification for the
2	classification Tree Trimmer.
3	MS. DYKE: Yes. The review of this
4	classification is part of the Civil Service
5	Commission's effort to review all classifications
6	every five years. While several forester-related
7	classification reviews were scheduled for this year,
8	the City's first strategic plan to invest long-term
9	in Columbus trees was approved by Columbus City
10	Council in April of 2021. In response to this
11	approval, there are many anticipated organizational
12	changes within the forester section of the Recreation
13	and Parks Department.
14	With forthcoming organizational changes,
15	it is agreed that only one minor revision be proposed
16	at this time. Within the minimum qualification
17	section it is proposed to revise the reference to the
18	National Arborist Association within the substitution
19	portion of the section as the association is now
20	recognized as the Tree Care Industry Association.
21	There are no other revisions proposed at this time,
22	and it is recommended that the specification be
23	revised as proposed.
24	MR. PRICE: I move to Item 15, I move



- 1 to revise the specification for the classification
- 2 Tree Trimmer.
- 3 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: Let me ask about
- 4 that. I'm sorry. Go ahead.
- 5 MS. LYNCH: No. Go ahead.
- 6 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: Get your second
- 7 first.
- 8 MS. LYNCH: Sure. I second the motion.
- 9 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: The National
- 10 Arborist organization, is that a nonprofit
- 11 professional organization?
- MS. DYKE: I'm not certain if it's a
- 13 profit or nonprofit.
- 14 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: It is recognized as
- the organization for credentials for arborists?
- MS. DYKE: Yes.
- 17 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: And you said in
- 18 April of 2021 there was a recognition that was by
- 19 city council of the plan for saving trees in
- 20 Columbus?
- 21 MS. DYKE: It's the Master Urban Forestry
- 22 Plan.
- 23 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: Master Urban
- 24 Forestry Plan.



1	MS. DYKE: Yes. It's more highlighted
2	within the report for this revision. I just kind of
3	narrowed it down a little bit for the presentation.
4	But it is mentioned within the report for that
5	revision for Tree Trimmer.
6	PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All right. Thank
7	you.
8	All in favor?
9	THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.
10	PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: They are approved.
11	Item No. 16 is a request of the Civil
12	Service Commission staff to revise the specification
13	for the classification Community Relations
14	Representative.
15	MS. ROLLINS: Good morning. I'm Tammy
16	Rollins. I'll be presenting the next couple items
17	for Charday Litzy-Taylor. The proposed revision to
18	the Community Relations Representative classification
19	is was part of a request that we received from the
20	Department of Public Service. The primary purpose
21	for today's revisions are to better communicate the
22	expectations associated with this classification. To
23	that end, the department has requested some minor
24	additions to the specification within the Examples of



1 Work Section and within the Knowledge, Skill and 2 Abilities Section. And there were no other revisions. Just 3 4 those small revisions to the body of the stack. MR. PRICE: I move to -- Item 16, I move to revise the specification for the classification Community Relations Representative. MS. LYNCH: Second the motion. PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say, 9 "Aye." 10 THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye. 11 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: It is approved. 12 Items No. 17 and 18 are joined together. 13 No. 17 is the request of the Civil Service Commission 14 15 staff to revise the specification for the 16 classification Equipment Operator I under the 17 probationary period of 365 days, designate the 18 examination type as noncompetitive and amend Rule XI accordingly. No. 18 is the request to revise the 19 specification for the classification Equipment 20 21 Operator II and designate the examination type as 22 noncompetitive. MS. ROLLINS: These reviews were initiated 2.3

at the request of the Department of Public Service



1 due to recruitment issues within the Equipment 2 Operator series. Due to the competitive nature of commercial driving jobs, both Equipment Operator I 3 4 and II have been historically difficult classifications for recruitment. We've experienced lower application rates, high no-show rates for the exam that have led to the need for multiple administrations of the exam each year. For example, 9 in the last eight years, we've had to administer these exams twelve times for lists that are generally 10 11 supposed to be two years. Equipment Operator I is the entry level 12 13 classification to the Equipment Operator series. Currently the minimum qualifications for this 14 15 classification require a commercial motor vehicle 16 operator's license and one year of experience 17 operating or assisting in the operation of a 18 commercial motor vehicle. It is proposed that the one year of experience be removed. However, it's 19 also important to note that current minimum 20 21 qualifications do not require that one year of 22 experience be driving a CDL vehicle, simply that that 2.3 experience be assisting in the operation and being 24 familiar with CDL vehicles, but not necessarily



1	driving the vehicle.
2	The removal of this one year of
3	experience, keeping the CDL requirement would allow
4	the department to recruit directly from CDL programs
5	and into the Equipment Operator I classification
6	where from that point they could provide the hands-on
7	training in-house on the specific vehicles that the
8	employee would be operating while in employment with
9	the City.
10	Additionally, due to the staffing and the
11	equipment required to administer the exam and the
12	fact that the equipment operated during the exam may
13	or may not be the equipment actually operated in the
14	position, it's been determined that it's no longer
15	practical to test for this classification.
16	Therefore, it's recommended that the examination type
17	for Equipment Operator I be changed to noncompetitive
18	and the probationary period increased to 365 days.
19	Within the Equipment Operator II
20	classification, the minimum qualifications currently
21	require two years of experience, again, operating or
22	assisting in the operation of the CDL vehicle and the
23	CDL requirement. It is proposed that the assisting

in the operation part of the in cue be removed so



1	that the end cues are strictly two years of
2	experience operating a commercial motor vehicle.
3	This would allow individuals to come in at the
4	Equipment Operator I, have the experience in the
5	specific vehicle and then possibly move up to the
6	Equipment Operator II classification.
7	At the Equipment Operator II level, in the
8	City, employees at this level can be expected to
9	operate a wide variety of equipment, from dump truck,
10	pick-up truck, roller, Thermo-Lay, flusher, street
11	sweeper, grader, semi truck, sledge hauler, paving
12	box, front end loader, skid steer, plow truck and so
13	forth. And it's never been feasible to test on these
14	different pieces of equipment, so we've tested on one
15	piece of equipment to provide an aptitude.
16	And then once the individual is in the
17	employment of the City, they learn the different
18	vehicles as their position continues with the City.
19	But it's the hiring department that is responsible
20	for making sure that the employee is properly trained
21	and has the ability to use the equipment that's
22	determined necessary for the specific position.
23	Again, due to the staffing and equipment
24	required to administer the exam, the number of



1	administrations needed each year has been challenging
2	and the fact that the Equipment Operator during the
3	exam may or may not even be the equipment that will
4	be operated once employed with the City, it, again,
5	has been determined that it's no longer practical to
6	test for this classification.
7	It is recommended that the examination
8	type be changed to noncompetitive. The current
9	probationary period for this class is already 365
LO	days, so no change is needed with that.
L1	MR. PRICE: Item 17, I move to revise the
L2	specification for the classification Equipment
13	Operator I, update the probationary period to 365
L 4	days, designate the examination type as
15	noncompetitive and amend Rule XI accordingly. Item
16	18, I also move to revise the specification for the
L7	classification Equipment Operator II and designate
L8	the examination type as noncompetitive.
L 9	MS. LYNCH: Second the motion.
20	PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say,
21	"Aye."
22	THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.
23	PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: They are approved.

24 Thank you.



1	Items No. 19, 20, 21, 22, 23 and 24 will
2	be joined together. Item No. 19 is request of the
3	Civil Service Commission staff to revise the
4	specification for the classification Aging Programs
5	Administrator. No. 20 is to revise the specification
6	for the classification Aging Principal Programs
7	Assistant Administrator. And 21 is to revise the
8	specification for the classification Aging Programs
9	Manager. 22 is to revise the specification for the
10	classification Aging Programs Case Management
11	Supervisor II. 23 is to revise the specification for
12	the classification Aging Programs Case Management
13	Supervisor I. And No. 24 is to revise the
14	specification for the classification Aging Programs
15	Provider Relations Specialist.
16	MS. LAGEMANN: Carol Lagemann, Personnel
17	Analyst II at the Civil Service Commission. The
18	review of these classifications is part of our effort
19	to review all classifications every five years.
20	Throughout the series, there were areas where the
21	abbreviation or the written description for the
22	Central Ohio Area Agency on Aging, COAAA, needed
23	updated. In addition, several classifications needed
24	to have their existing Knowledge, Skills and



1	Abilities reordered from highest knowledge to lowest
2	knowledge or from knowledge skill to abilities.
3	Within the Aging Programs Administrator
4	classification, the minimum qualifications are
5	proposed to be revised to focus on the three
6	components that are most essential to the work with
7	implementing, managing and/or evaluating programs
8	pertaining to aging, health and human services.
9	Within the Aging Programs Assistant
10	Administrator class, the proposed statement regarding
11	running an independent IT office is included in the
12	Examples of Work and the Knowledge, Skills and
13	Abilities Section to include the proposed statement
14	for grant management knowledge. Within Aging
15	Programs Manager, there's an update to the Known
16	Qualifications Section proposed to move the long-term
17	qualifier on health programs and to revise the target
18	audience as consumers instead of just "older adults."
19	Within the Aging Programs Manager, Aging
20	Programs Case Management Supervisor II, Aging
21	Programs Case Management Supervisor I and Aging
22	Programs Supervisor Relations Specialist
23	classifications, updates are proposed to the Examples
24	of Work, Knowledge, Skills and Abilities Sections to



1 include testimony, preparation, wording updates 2 and/or inclusion of the other individuals with a high level of health and service needs as needed. 3 4 In addition, knowledge of legislation and 5 responses to audit results were included in the Supervisor II. It's recommended these classifications be approved as proposed. MR. PRICE: Item 19, I move to revise the 9 specification for the classification Aging Programs 10 Administrator. Item 20, I also move to revise the specification for the classification Aging Programs 11 Assistant Administrator. Item 21, I also move to 12 13 revise the specification for the classification Aging Programs Manager. Item 22, I also move to revise the 14 15 specification for the classification Aging Programs 16 Case Management Supervisor II. Item 23, I also move 17 to revise the specification for the classification 18 Aging Programs Case Management Supervisor I. Item 24, I also move to revise the specification for the 19 classification Aging Programs Provider Relations 20 21 Specialist. 22 MS. LYNCH: I second the motions. PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say, 2.3 "Aye." 24



Item No. 25 is a request of the Civil Service Commission staff to revise the specification for the classification Property Maintenance Inspection Manager. MS. LAGEMANN: Carol Lagemann. Again, the review of this classification is by request of the Department of Building and Zoning Services. It's proposed to revise the current specification to remove the guidelines for Class Use Section that limits this class to only one incumbent. The Department of Building and Zoning Services recently acquired the code enforcement provision from the Department of Development. And by removing this restriction, the work at the department could be allocated more effectively. It's recommended this classification be approved as proposed. MR. PRICE: Item 25, I move to revise the specification for the classification Property Maintenance Inspection Manager. MS. LYNCH: I second the motion. PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say, "Aye."	1	THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.
Service Commission staff to revise the specification for the classification Property Maintenance Inspection Manager. MS. LAGEMANN: Carol Lagemann. Again, the review of this classification is by request of the Department of Building and Zoning Services. It's proposed to revise the current specification to remove the guidelines for Class Use Section that limits this class to only one incumbent. The Department of Building and Zoning Services recently acquired the code enforcement provision from the Department of Development. And by removing this restriction, the work at the department could be allocated more effectively. It's recommended this classification be approved as proposed. MR. PRICE: Item 25, I move to revise the specification for the classification Property Maintenance Inspection Manager. MS. LYNCH: I second the motion. PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say,	2	PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: They are approved.
for the classification Property Maintenance Inspection Manager. MS. LAGEMANN: Carol Lagemann. Again, the review of this classification is by request of the Department of Building and Zoning Services. It's proposed to revise the current specification to remove the guidelines for Class Use Section that limits this class to only one incumbent. The Department of Building and Zoning Services recently acquired the code enforcement provision from the Department of Development. And by removing this restriction, the work at the department could be allocated more effectively. It's recommended this classification be approved as proposed. MR. PRICE: Item 25, I move to revise the specification for the classification Property Maintenance Inspection Manager. MS. LYNCH: I second the motion. PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say,	3	Item No. 25 is a request of the Civil
MS. LAGEMANN: Carol Lagemann. Again, the review of this classification is by request of the pepartment of Building and Zoning Services. It's proposed to revise the current specification to remove the guidelines for Class Use Section that limits this class to only one incumbent. The Department of Building and Zoning Services recently acquired the code enforcement provision from the Department of Development. And by removing this restriction, the work at the department could be allocated more effectively. It's recommended this classification be approved as proposed. MR. PRICE: Item 25, I move to revise the specification for the classification Property Maintenance Inspection Manager. MS. LYNCH: I second the motion. PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say,	4	Service Commission staff to revise the specification
MS. LAGEMANN: Carol Lagemann. Again, the review of this classification is by request of the Department of Building and Zoning Services. It's proposed to revise the current specification to remove the guidelines for Class Use Section that limits this class to only one incumbent. The Department of Building and Zoning Services recently acquired the code enforcement provision from the Department of Development. And by removing this restriction, the work at the department could be allocated more effectively. It's recommended this classification be approved as proposed. MR. PRICE: Item 25, I move to revise the specification for the classification Property Maintenance Inspection Manager. MS. LYNCH: I second the motion. PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say,	5	for the classification Property Maintenance
review of this classification is by request of the Department of Building and Zoning Services. It's proposed to revise the current specification to remove the guidelines for Class Use Section that limits this class to only one incumbent. The Department of Building and Zoning Services recently acquired the code enforcement provision from the Department of Development. And by removing this restriction, the work at the department could be allocated more effectively. It's recommended this classification be approved as proposed. MR. PRICE: Item 25, I move to revise the specification for the classification Property Maintenance Inspection Manager. MS. LYNCH: I second the motion. PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say,	6	Inspection Manager.
Department of Building and Zoning Services. It's proposed to revise the current specification to remove the guidelines for Class Use Section that limits this class to only one incumbent. The Department of Building and Zoning Services recently acquired the code enforcement provision from the Department of Development. And by removing this restriction, the work at the department could be allocated more effectively. It's recommended this classification be approved as proposed. MR. PRICE: Item 25, I move to revise the specification for the classification Property Maintenance Inspection Manager. MS. LYNCH: I second the motion. PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say,	7	MS. LAGEMANN: Carol Lagemann. Again, the
proposed to revise the current specification to remove the guidelines for Class Use Section that limits this class to only one incumbent. The Department of Building and Zoning Services recently acquired the code enforcement provision from the Department of Development. And by removing this restriction, the work at the department could be allocated more effectively. It's recommended this classification be approved as proposed. MR. PRICE: Item 25, I move to revise the specification for the classification Property Maintenance Inspection Manager. MS. LYNCH: I second the motion. PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say,	8	review of this classification is by request of the
remove the guidelines for Class Use Section that limits this class to only one incumbent. The Department of Building and Zoning Services recently acquired the code enforcement provision from the Department of Development. And by removing this restriction, the work at the department could be allocated more effectively. It's recommended this classification be approved as proposed. MR. PRICE: Item 25, I move to revise the specification for the classification Property Maintenance Inspection Manager. MS. LYNCH: I second the motion. PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say,	9	Department of Building and Zoning Services. It's
limits this class to only one incumbent. The Department of Building and Zoning Services recently acquired the code enforcement provision from the Department of Development. And by removing this restriction, the work at the department could be allocated more effectively. It's recommended this classification be approved as proposed. MR. PRICE: Item 25, I move to revise the specification for the classification Property Maintenance Inspection Manager. MS. LYNCH: I second the motion. PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say,	10	proposed to revise the current specification to
Department of Building and Zoning Services recently acquired the code enforcement provision from the Department of Development. And by removing this restriction, the work at the department could be allocated more effectively. It's recommended this classification be approved as proposed. MR. PRICE: Item 25, I move to revise the specification for the classification Property Maintenance Inspection Manager. MS. LYNCH: I second the motion. PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say,	11	remove the guidelines for Class Use Section that
acquired the code enforcement provision from the Department of Development. And by removing this restriction, the work at the department could be allocated more effectively. It's recommended this classification be approved as proposed. MR. PRICE: Item 25, I move to revise the specification for the classification Property Maintenance Inspection Manager. MS. LYNCH: I second the motion. PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say,	12	limits this class to only one incumbent. The
Department of Development. And by removing this restriction, the work at the department could be allocated more effectively. It's recommended this classification be approved as proposed. MR. PRICE: Item 25, I move to revise the specification for the classification Property Maintenance Inspection Manager. MS. LYNCH: I second the motion. PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say,	13	Department of Building and Zoning Services recently
restriction, the work at the department could be allocated more effectively. It's recommended this classification be approved as proposed. MR. PRICE: Item 25, I move to revise the specification for the classification Property Maintenance Inspection Manager. MS. LYNCH: I second the motion. PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say,	14	acquired the code enforcement provision from the
allocated more effectively. It's recommended this classification be approved as proposed. MR. PRICE: Item 25, I move to revise the specification for the classification Property Maintenance Inspection Manager. MS. LYNCH: I second the motion. PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say,	15	Department of Development. And by removing this
classification be approved as proposed. MR. PRICE: Item 25, I move to revise the specification for the classification Property Maintenance Inspection Manager. MS. LYNCH: I second the motion. PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say,	16	restriction, the work at the department could be
MR. PRICE: Item 25, I move to revise the specification for the classification Property Maintenance Inspection Manager. MS. LYNCH: I second the motion. PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say,	17	allocated more effectively. It's recommended this
specification for the classification Property Maintenance Inspection Manager. MS. LYNCH: I second the motion. PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say,	18	classification be approved as proposed.
Maintenance Inspection Manager. MS. LYNCH: I second the motion. PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say,	19	MR. PRICE: Item 25, I move to revise the
MS. LYNCH: I second the motion. PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say,	20	specification for the classification Property
PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say,	21	Maintenance Inspection Manager.
- '	22	MS. LYNCH: I second the motion.
24 "Aye."	23	PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say,
	24	"Aye."



1	THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.
2	PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: It is approved.
3	Item No. 26, this is a request of the
4	Civil Service Commission staff to revise the
5	specification for the classification Public Safety
6	Director.
7	MS. ROLLINS: This classification was
8	scheduled for review as part of the Commission's
9	effort to review all classifications at least once
10	every five years. Based on this review, there is one
11	proposed revision to the Examples of Work Section,
12	which is to include that the activities and staffing
13	of the 911 emergency communications center are
14	reflected under the Support Services Division rather
15	than the police division. This was a reorganization
16	that took place earlier this year, so the proposed
17	revision is simply to reflect the current
18	organizational structure for Public Safety.
19	MR. PRICE: Item 26, I move to revise the
20	specification for the classification Public Safety
21	Director unclassified.
22	MS. LYNCH: I second the motion.
23	PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say,
24	"Aye."



1	THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.
2	PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: It is approved.
3	Item No. 27 is deferred. Item No. 28 is
4	the request of the Civil Service Commission staff to
5	create the specification for the classification
6	Public Relations Advisor to the Police Chief, assign
7	a probationary period of 365 days, designate the
8	examination type as noncompetitive and amend Rule XI
9	accordingly.
10	MS. ROLLINS: Efforts to reimagine the
11	police division continue. Much effort is being
12	placed to ensure that the police chief has the
13	staffing resources available to her to run the
14	division effectively and in fulfillment of the City's
15	goals and objectives. As such, the Public Safety
16	Director has requested the creation of a new
17	classification to meet the public relations needs for
18	the division.
19	So as the public relations unit is
20	restructured, it's necessary to have a classification
21	available to serve as the primary advisor to the
22	Police Chief on matters related to media and public
23	relations and also have this classification capable
24	of supervising a professional public relations team.



1 In the past, this role has been most often served by 2 sworn personnel. However, in the last few years, a 3 growing trend has emerged suggesting the dedicated use of civilian staff in the role of public relations over more traditionally utilized sworn staff. Further evidence has shown that having this position -- position very close to the police 8 chief or in any reporting relationship to the police 9 chief is of the utmost importance. A review of the 10 City's class plan reveals that we have no existing classification to fulfill this specific need. It is 11 therefore proposed that the new classification Public 12 Relations Advisor to the Police Chief be created to 13 meet this need within the police division. 14 By definition, the proposed classification 15 16 would be responsible for advising the police chief on 17 matters relating to media and public relations for 18 the Division of Police. This would be a single position classification used specifically, 19 20 exclusively within the Division of Police. And the 21 minimum qualifications would be built upon the current Public Relations Specialist II 22 2.3 classification, which would be a staff level position of this one. And so it would be two years additional 24



- 1 experience, which would basically make the minimum 2 qualifications a bachelor's degree and five years of professional experience in media, journalism, 3 4 marketing or public relations with a substitution for 5 a master's degree. It is recommended that the probationary period be assigned 365 days and that the examination type be designated as noncompetitive. PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: And to amend Rule 9 XI. MS. ROLLINS: And to amend Rule XI. 10 MR. PRICE: Item 28, I move to create the 11 specification for the classification Public Relations 12 13 Advisor to the Police Chief, assign a probationary period of 365 days, designate the examination type as 14 15 noncompetitive and amend Rule XI accordingly. 16 MS. LYNCH: I second the motion. 17 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say,
- 19 THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.
- 20 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: It is approved.
- 21 Thank you.

"Aye."

18

- 22 Item No. 29 is request of the Civil
- 23 Service Commission staff to revise the specification
- 24 for the classification Police Officer.



1	MS. REED: Hello again. Liz Reed with the
2	Civil Service Commission, Civil Service Commission
3	Executive Assistant Director responsible for testing.
4	On behalf of the Civil Service Commission staff, I am
5	pleased to request the revision of the specification
6	for the classification of Police Officer.
7	The adjusted revisions are a culmination
8	of a great deal of work. We considered information
9	gained through the Columbus Community Safety Advisory
10	Commission, the cultural sensitivity reviews, the
11	police officer selection process audit and the 2021
12	police officer job analysis.
13	The most notable changes reflect showing
13 14	The most notable changes reflect showing the importance of a service orientation as indicated
14	the importance of a service orientation as indicated
14 15	the importance of a service orientation as indicated in the proposed change to the definition. Also the
14 15 16	the importance of a service orientation as indicated in the proposed change to the definition. Also the impact of the job analysis results which resulted in
14 15 16 17	the importance of a service orientation as indicated in the proposed change to the definition. Also the impact of the job analysis results which resulted in post chances to the task statements and the
14 15 16 17	the importance of a service orientation as indicated in the proposed change to the definition. Also the impact of the job analysis results which resulted in post chances to the task statements and the Knowledge, Skills and Abilities statements.
14 15 16 17 18	the importance of a service orientation as indicated in the proposed change to the definition. Also the impact of the job analysis results which resulted in post chances to the task statements and the Knowledge, Skills and Abilities statements. We propose adding language to the
14 15 16 17 18 19	the importance of a service orientation as indicated in the proposed change to the definition. Also the impact of the job analysis results which resulted in post chances to the task statements and the Knowledge, Skills and Abilities statements. We propose adding language to the guidelines to class use to include the clarification
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the importance of a service orientation as indicated in the proposed change to the definition. Also the impact of the job analysis results which resulted in post chances to the task statements and the Knowledge, Skills and Abilities statements. We propose adding language to the guidelines to class use to include the clarification that the probationary period conclude 365 days after



1 at the time of application and for the minimum 2 qualification to allow candidates to be 21 years of 3 age at the time of being sworn in. 4 Both changes open access to the job and 5 remove unnecessary delays to employment. Typically for changes to the minimum qualifications -typically for changes in the minimum qualifications 8 they take effect prospectively. However, for the 9 proposed change to the age requirement, the Civil Service Commission proposes this change take place 10 for the current police officer eligible list. The 11 age requirement remains 20 at time of application. 12 Making this -- making this effective immediately 13 would only result in removing a delay for otherwise 14 eligible candidates. 15 16 MR. PRICE: I have a question. 17 PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: Go ahead. 18 MR. PRICE: Thank you, Commissioner. And I guess this question might be to Amy, might be to 19 20 Amy. 21 Is this some of the things that we heard 22 in community meetings that we're now reflecting in this? Okay. Well, I would say again on behalf of 2.3 24 the commission it's good, because this is some of the



1	things we heard in our community meetings, some
2	suggestions from regular folk in the community. So
3	I'm glad to see that we're making a move to make
4	those changes. Thank you.
5	Item 29, I move to revise the
6	specification for the classification Police Officer.
7	MS. LYNCH: Second the motion.
8	PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: All in favor say,
9	"Aye."
10	THE COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.
11	PRESIDENT PETTIGREW: It is approved.
12	Item 30, we have no residency hearing
13	reviews this month. Item 31, on background removals,
14	the commissioners have agreed upon the following:
15	For Joshua Bryan, reinstate; for Dane Heughebart, do
16	not reinstate; for Douglas Barber, II, reinstate; for
17	Ryan McGinty, reinstate; for Lydell Smith, reinstate;
18	for John Penfield, reinstate; for Jalen Glenn, do not
19	reinstate.
20	The remaining item on the agenda is the
21	other administrative and jurisdictional reviews.
22	After having reviewed the letter, the review and
23	approval of the decision regarding the appeal filed
24	October 8, 2021, regarding a denied request for



1	review for Curtis Marshall, Appeal No. 21-CA-0004 is
2	approved as written; and the director is authorized
3	to distribute that letter.
4	With that, we have completed the agenda,
5	and we are adjourned.
6	
7	And, thereupon, the hearing was adjourned
8	at 1:06 p.m.
9	
4	C-E-R-T-I-F-I-C-A-T-E
5	
6	I do hereby certify that the foregoing is
7	a true, correct and complete written transcript of
8	the proceedings in this matter, taken by me on the
9	29th day of November, 2021, and transcribed from my
10	stenographic notes.
11	
12	
13	
14	MARILYN K. MARTIN Notary Public in and for the State of Ohio
15	and Registered Professional Reporter.
16	
17	My Commission Expires October 16, 2026.